

Date: Fri, 28 Oct 94 04:30:16 PDT  
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>  
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu  
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu  
Precedence: List  
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V94 #510  
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest                      Fri, 28 Oct 94                      Volume 94 : Issue    510

Today's Topics:

                    NoCal 00 goes after Packet BULLetins

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>  
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>  
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available  
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text  
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official  
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

-----  
Date: Thu, 27 Oct 94 19:17:43 -0500  
From: Ed Ellers <edellers@delphi.com>  
Subject: NoCal 00 goes after Packet BULLetins

Steve Wolf <sww@csuohio.edu> writes:

>You are again emphasising the mode rather than the mode's effect on the  
>information. If I get a bulletin by RTTY or via packet, the bulletin was  
>not changed by the mode. It is still a bulletin addressed to the (amateur)  
>public.

It's addressed to the AMATEUR public -- not to the general public. The mode  
DOES make a difference here, because the mode prevents the message from being  
made readily available by radio to non-amateurs. If you transmit to the PBBS.,  
and the PBBS sends you the bulletin back, that's a \*two-way\* contact.

-----  
Date: 27 Oct 1994 23:26:51 GMT  
From: little@iamu.chi.dec.com (Todd Little)

References<Cy8J1v.3wA@wang.com> <19940ct26.114636.5713@ke4zv.atl.ga.us> ,

<CyCEKB.7Hq@wang.com>  
Reply-To: little@iamu.chi.dec.com (Todd Little)  
Subject: Re: NoCal 00 goes after Packet BULletins

In article <CyCEKB.7Hq@wang.com>, dbushong@wang.com (Dave Bushong) writes:

|>Again, this discussion is not about speech content, but one-way  
|>communications.

Good, I'm glad you see our point then. The communication is two-way. I send a packet to the PBBS and it sends me an acknowledgement. What is one-way about that? The content may be construed as one-way, but the communication is definitely two-way. That is unless you set up your beacon text to be a 10 line cookie recipe. ;-)

And to whomever it was (was it you Dave?) that made the comments about folks being too cheap to purchase Internet access or whatever, that is really a stretch. That is like saying we should eliminate the phone bands because people are too cheap to make long distance calls.

73,  
Todd  
N9MWB

-----  
Date: Thu, 27 Oct 94 19:23:33 -0500  
From: Ed Ellers <edellers@delphi.com>

References<CyB5vA.9w8@news.Hawaii.Edu> <38nks8\$8io@abyss.West.Sun.COM>,  
<CyC9v1.KJJ@news.Hawaii.Edu>  
Subject: Re: Questions on this and that

Jeffrey Herman <jeffrey@kahuna.tmc.edu> writes:

>You missed the point, Dana. There was nothing in the rules to  
>strictly prohibit the use of . . . . / . . but pink slips  
>were given out anyway. The FCC is allowed a broad interpretation  
>of their own rules. They felt that the prosign CQ must be used  
>to establish a QSO - anything else was prohibited.

Because, of course, FCC monitoring personnel know what CQ means but not what "dit dididit dit" means. The same principle is (or was) found in the CB rules in Part 95, which provided (and may still) that "10-codes" could only be used if a copy of the 10-code list was kept in the station records so it could be checked by the FCC folks if a question arose.

-----  
Date: 27 Oct 1994 22:06:51 GMT  
From: myers@sunspot.West.Sun.COM (Dana Myers)

References<CyAL1u.3Jy@wang.com> <wyn.206.2EAEAF14@ornl.gov>,  
<CyC92u.KFE@news.Hawaii.Edu>  
Subject: Re: NoCal 00 , packet BBS that lists posts by "topic"?

In article <CyC92u.KFE@news.Hawaii.Edu> jeffrey@math.hawaii.edu writes:  
>wyn@ornl.gov (C. C. (Clay) Wynn, N4AOX) writes:  
>  
>> No wonder the FCC despairs over the Ham bands.  
>  
>They do? I've always heard that the FCC has nothing but praise  
>for amateurs.

Hmmm... the Washington staffer I spoke to a while ago seemed to be  
pretty amused by the activities of amateurs. By the way, this staffer  
is also an active amateur. Clay is maybe editorializing a little bit,  
but I think he's mostly correct this time.

--

\* Dana H. Myers KK6JQ, DoD#: j | Views expressed here are \*  
\* (310) 348-6043 | mine and do not necessarily \*  
\* Dana.Myers@West.Sun.Com | reflect those of my employer \*  
\* "Antenna waves be burnin' up my radio" -- ZZ Top \*

-----  
Date: Thu, 27 Oct 94 22:06:25 GMT  
From: mark@ve6mgs.ampr.org (Mark G. Salyzyn)

References<Cy8J1v.3wA@wang.com> <19940ct26.114636.5713@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>,  
<CyCEKB.7Hq@wang.com>  
Subject: Re: NoCal 00 goes after Packet BULLETins

dbushong@wang.com (Dave Bushong) writes:

> (b) An amateur station shall not engage in any form of  
>broadcasting, nor may an amateur station transmit one-way  
>communications except as specifically provided in these rules;

AX.25 is specifically allowed for in the rules ...

Ciao -- Mark

-----  
End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #510  
\*\*\*\*\*